

American-made goods. One part of my bill would require that all Federal departments and agencies submit annual reports on their purchases. The amendment that I am offering today is based on that provision in my bill.

The Buy American Act requires that the Federal Government support domestic businesses and domestic workers by buying American-made goods. I am pleased to note that the underlying bill includes language that states that none of the funds appropriated to the Department of Homeland Security may be used in contravention of the applicable provisions of the Buy American Act.

It only makes sense that Federal departments and agencies be required to report to Congress on their compliance with Federal law and with congressional intent regarding this important matter.

The American people deserve to know how their tax dollars are being spent, and to what extent these dollars are being used to support foreign jobs. I look forward to reviewing the fiscal year 2004 versions of these reports, and I am pleased that the managers have worked with me to extend the requirement for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2005. I will continue my efforts to ensure that this simple reporting requirement is made permanent for all Federal departments and agencies.

Again, I thank the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee for agreeing to accept my amendment, and I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 3620

CONTRACTS

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator, does the amendment apply to any existing contract at the Department of Homeland Security?

Mr. LEVIN. No, the amendment would only apply to new contracts signed after the date of enactment.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the Senator. Does that mean that the Senator's amendment will not prohibit any task order, change order or extension issued in connection with an existing contract awarded prior to the date of enactment?

Mr. LEVIN. The Senator is correct. The intent of the amendment is to only capture new contracts.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the Senator. So this amendment will not impact task orders issued under the US VISIT contract awarded to Accenture and the Smart Border Alliance?

Mr. LEVIN. The Senator is correct, the amendment is not intended to impact that contract or any task orders issued under the US VISIT contract.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. COCHRAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum, unless the manager has more.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I do not know of any other Senator who is

planning to speak or offer an amendment at this time, so I think it is appropriate to put in a quorum call, unless we go to morning business.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent we go now to morning business.

Mr. COCHRAN. We have no objection to going into morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will now proceed to a period for morning business.

JOHN KERRY'S HEALTH CARE PLAN

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would like to speak briefly on another matter. It came to my attention that the President, today, spoke in Muskegon, MI, about health care. The President derided JOHN KERRY's plan for reforming health care as a bureaucratic nightmare and contended it would cost \$1.5 trillion.

I want to mention for the record, when this President became President we were spending \$1.3 trillion on health care. Now we are spending \$1.8 trillion on health care. Do you hear me? That is a half a trillion dollars. That is a half-trillion-dollar increase that Americans are now spending on health care. What do we have to show for results? We have to show, as a result, that an average family would have to pay \$10,000 for a family policy for comprehensive health care.

The results will show we have had the greatest decline in coverage of insurance for American workers during the last 3 years in the history of our health insurance debate. Drug prices are skyrocketing right up through the roof. Ask any senior citizen about the cost increase in prescription drugs. At the same time, you will find some of the greatest profits in the history of the drug companies and the HMOs.

I suggest that the tactics of fear and smear no longer be used when it comes to health care debates. Let us get rid of fear and smear. The facts do not add up to the recommendations and the suggestions we heard this afternoon. We know health insurance coverage is a crisis in this country in terms of cost and the increased numbers of uninsured and that prices are going up through the roof. Yet this administration absolutely opposed any opportunity for negotiated prices in terms of prescription drugs in the Medicare legislation last year.

Distortion and misrepresentation is a great concern to me. We have seen this administration distort and misrepresent intelligence about getting us into Iraq. We have seen them distort and misrepresent intelligence when they talk about our economy. It has been true with regard to education and leaving 4.5 million children out of the No Child Left Behind Program.

As I have said at other times, when this Nation made a commitment that

we were going to cover Medicare, we covered all of our seniors. When we said we were going to cover voting rights, we covered all of our Americans who should have been eligible for voting rights. When we said we were going to cover all children in this country—and 4.5 million of them being left out and behind—I compared it to the fact that when President Kennedy said we were going to the Moon, Congress gave us half the money to get us up to \$150 million and not do anything else but get our astronauts to the Moon and not bring them home. Those are the facts.

That is why these representations and debate in terms of health care, in terms of education, in terms of our economy, and in terms of Iraq—this is an administration that has failed in terms of its responsibilities. It is misleading the American people on issue after issue. That is what this debate is about. We will have a chance to see its outcome on election day.

I yield the floor.

HONORING DR. CATHERINE SNELSON

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I today congratulate Dr. Catherine Snelson, assistant professor of geoscience at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, for receiving the 2003 Presidential Early Career Award for Scientists and Engineers, PECASE.

This award is the highest honor bestowed by the U.S. Government on young scientists at the outset of their careers. In addition, Cathy has also received the Early Career Scientist and Engineer Award from the National Nuclear Security Administration's Office of Defense Programs.

I commend Dr. Snelson for her hard work and commitment to academic excellence in the public interest.

Dr. Snelson received her B.S. from California State University at Hayward in 1995, and her M.S. and her Ph.D. in geophysics from the University of Texas at El Paso. While completing these degrees, she performed fieldwork in the western United States, Ireland, and central Europe.

Since joining the faculty of UNLV as an assistant professor in January 2002, Dr. Snelson has continued to do important research that will protect the people of Nevada. Specifically she has identified areas that would be most affected by seismic events occurring in and around the Las Vegas Valley, and she has been involved in setting up motion recording stations to monitor earthquakes throughout the valley.

Please join me in congratulating Dr. Catherine Snelson for her academic excellence, and in wishing her well in her promising career as a geoscientist.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the

Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

In Baltimore, MD, in 1999, a group of six people went on a crime spree that included over a dozen armed robberies and four car-jackings. While most of the victims were threatened at gunpoint and otherwise not injured, one man was hit in the head with a baseball bat and Tacy Ranta, a prominent transgender activist, was fatally shot in the chest. When one of the assailants asked the shooter why he had shot "that lady," the shooter replied "that was no lady—that was a faggot." Some transgender activists believe that since Ranta was the only one killed, the murder was a hate crime based on her status as a transsexual.

I believe that the Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1994

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, today marks the 10-year anniversary of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. The bill, which was the product of bi-partisan compromise, took a balanced position to criminal justice policy, strengthening many Federal penalties, providing funding to build prisons and promoting truth-in-sentencing. Most importantly, the act made important investments in programs designed to prevent crime in the first place, including putting 100,000 community policing officers on the street and reducing violence against women and children.

To ensure this bill's passage, I worked harder than I ever had in the U.S. Senate. Prior to the final vote, in August of 1994, I stated that "I will vote for this bill, because, as much as anything I have ever voted on in 22 years in the U.S. Senate, I truly believe that passage of this legislation will make a difference in the lives of the American people. I believe with every fiber in my being that if this bill passes, fewer people will be murdered, fewer people will be victims, fewer women will be senselessly beaten, fewer people will continue on the drug path, and fewer children will become criminals."

Fortunately, this turned out to be right. With the passage of the Biden crime bill we were able to form a partnership amongst Federal, State, and local law enforcement and create programs that helped drive down crime rates for 8 consecutive years. In 1994 we had historically high rates of violent crimes, such as murders, forcible rapes,

and aggravated assaults. We were able to reduce these to the lowest levels in a generation. We reduced the murder rate by 37.8 percent; we reduced forcible rapes by 19.1 percent; and we reduced aggravated assaults by 25.5 percent. Property crimes, including auto thefts, also were reduced from historical highs to the lowest levels in decades.

How were we able to achieve such great results? Well, we all know it was a combination of factors, but most law enforcement officials credit the Office of Community Oriented Policing with a pivotal role. Indeed, in the words of Attorney General Ashcroft, the Community Oriented Policing program has been "a miraculous success." COPS has funded over 118,000 local officers to patrol our neighborhoods and towns and help drive down crime rates. Because of COPS, the concept of community policing has spread to cities and towns across the country.

A testament to the success of the program is the fact that it has been endorsed by every major law enforcement group in the country, including the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), the National Association of Police Organizations, the National Sheriff's Association, the International Brotherhood of Police Organizations, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Officials, the International Union of Police Associations, the Fraternal Order of Police, and others.

Completely disregarding the overwhelming success of COPS, the Bush administration and Republican leadership have set their sights on eliminating this program. President Bush has proposed cuts each year he has been in office, and while we have fought to maintain funding for COPS, we are fighting an uphill battle. Funding for 5 State and local law enforcement programs run out of the Department of Justice is down 75.6 percent since fiscal year 2002. To me, this approach is inexplicable, particularly because the need for Federal assistance remains pressing.

Recent articles from USA Today and the New York Times highlighted the fact that many cities are being forced to eliminate officers because of their woeful local budgets. In fact, New York City has lost 3,000 officers in the last few years. Other cities, such as Cleveland, OH, Milwaukee, MN, and Houston, TX, are facing similar shortages. As a result, local police chiefs are reluctantly pulling officers from the proactive policing activities that were so successful in the nineties. This has not been a choice taken lightly. Police chiefs understand the value of proactive policing; however, they simply don't have the manpower to do it all. Basically, we have been asking them to do more with less, and responding to emergency calls must take precedence over proactive programs. However, I fear that we are starting to see the results. Local chiefs are report-

ing increased gang activity. Murder rates and auto thefts—two very accurate indicators of crime trends—have gone up for 3 consecutive years.

The Bush administration's response to these criticisms is that funding for first responders is way up. Undoubtedly, these are critical, necessary expenditures, and I believe that the administration has not invested enough for our first responders. However, this argument misses the point entirely. We have an obligation to do both. We must fund our first responders and invest in the programs that help reduce traditional crime and prevent terrorism. As the President has stated on many occasions, it is the solemn duty of the Federal Government to keep Americans safe. We simply can't achieve this goal without investing in our State and local law enforcement partners. The COPS office has been a critical lynchpin in the Federal, State, and local partnership that has been effective since the passage of the 1994 Biden crime bill, and I hope that the Bush administration and this Congress will reverse its current course and provide critical funding for this program.

Another component of the 1994 Biden crime bill was the Violence Against Women Act. With the passage of the Violence Against Women Act we started talking about that dirty little secret that no one wanted to say out loud, and as a result women and children have become safer. Instead of suffering alone, a rape victim or battered wife can now turn to a trained police officer, an emergency room nurse, or a 1-800 telephone operator. We've transformed so-called "family matters" into public crimes that hold the offender accountable and provide the victim with meaningful services.

Since fiscal year 1995, nearly \$3.8 billion has been appropriated for the programs created by the Violence Against Women Act. In Delaware alone, the Office on Violence Against Women has overseen 21 grant awards totaling \$9.5 million. These investments have paid off. Domestic violence has dropped nearly 50 percent. Incidents of rape are down by 60 percent. The number of women killed by an abusive husband or boyfriend is down 22 percent. Today, more than half of all rape victims are stepping forward to report the crime, and over a million women have found justice in our courtrooms and obtained domestic violence protection orders.

Of course, we need to do more. As more and more brave women step forward to report a rape or seek a restraining order, more demands are placed on women's shelters, State prosecutors, victim advocates, and other resources. As we encourage victim reporting and swift responses by our criminal justice system, we must continue to create and support services for families in distress. We cannot let the Violence Against Women Act become a victim of its own success.

To ensure that VAWA is passed on to the next generation, we have begun